

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on October 5, 2004 (hereinafter "the Office Action") objected to the original Abstract as containing a legal term "comprises", rejected claims 1-5 as unpatentably obvious in view of the cited prior art, indicated that claims 6-8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and allowed original claims 9-17. It is believed that the foregoing amendments to the claims and the Abstract overcome each of the objections and rejections and therefore reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Abstract has been amended by deleting the legal term "comprises" and substituting the word "has". It is believed that this overcomes the objection in the Office Action to the Abstract but, if not, the Examiner is requested to suggest an alternative amendment to the Abstract.

Original dependent claims 6, 7 and 8 have been rewritten in independent form to include each of the limitations, verbatim, of the claims from which those claims are dependent. Specifically, claims 6 depended only from claim 1 and all of claim 1 has been added to claim 6. Claim 7 depended from claim 2 which dependent from claim 1 and all of claims 1 and 2 have been added to claim 7. Finally, claim 8 depended from claim 4 which depended from claim 1 and all of claims 1 and 4 have been added to claim 8. Thus, it is believed that claims 6, 7 and 8 are no longer objectionable as depending from rejected claims and therefore are allowable, as indicated in the Office Action.

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentably obvious over Deo, et al. in view of Coleman. Although it is believed that the Office Action misinterprets or misapplies Deo, et al. with respect to the manner in which the frame mounts the glass panel to the bottom wall compared to applicant's claimed-mounting, applicant has amended claim 1 to more specifically define that mounting arrangement. The Office Action asserts that Deo discloses, among other things, "a frame around a perimeter of glass panel (Figure 6), and a fastener (column 5, line 48 – column 6, line 9)", which assertedly meets the frame and fastener subparagraphs of claim 1. However, the frame in Deo, et al. that encircles the glass panel does not extend "around an upper perimeter surface of said glass panel" as required by original claim 1. Further, the only "fastener" disclosed in Deo, et al. is the use of a curable sealant 38 "around the perimeter of plate 26, followed by application of downward pressure on plate 26 during a period in which sealant 38 is allowed to set" (column 5, lines 59-62), which is not a disclosure of "removable fasteners" as required by original claim 1. However, claim 1 has been amended to specifically require that the frame extends "over the top of" the glass panel which was believed to be inherently defined in the original claim. Further, the frame has been defined as having "an outer portion extending outwardly over an adjacent portion of said bottom wall" and that the removable "mechanical" fasteners mount that "outer portion" of the frame to the bottom wall. Thus claim 1 more clearly and structurally distinguishes over Deo, et al. , which, in fact merely uses an encircling "not overlapping" frame and a curable sealant for mounting the glass panel to the structure. The secondary reference of Coleman does not disclose anything relevant to the mounting of the glass panel on the structure and

was not applied for that purpose. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.


Claims 2, 3, 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable whereby the rejections of those four claims is also overcome.

In summary, it is believed that the amendments to the claims and the Abstract overcome the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action for the reasons set forth above and therefore a favorable action on the merits of this application is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized during prosecution of this application and any related appeal, to charge any fees that may be required (except for patent issue fees required under 37 CFR §1.18) or to credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0337. Please show our docket number 7285-131.US with any credit or charge to the deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Feb 4, '05


Conrad R. Solum
Registration No. 20,467

Fulbright & Jaworski
Customer No. 000167